	ed States Paten	T AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	UNITED STATES DEPAR United States Hatent and Addess: COMMISSIONER F P.O. BD 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 223 www.dspto.gov	TMENT OF COMMERCE Trademark Office OR PATENTS 113-1450
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,836	02/03/2004	Lauri Paatero	915-008.020	9737
4955 7590 04/19/2007 WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP			EXAMINER CHEN, SHIN HON	
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468			2131	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE MAIL DATE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/19/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

.

.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/771,836	PAATERO, LAURI
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shin-Hon Chen	2131
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet w	with the correspondence address
Period for Reply		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC ute, cause the application to become a	IICATION. a reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01	June 2004.	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th	is action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal ma	itters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application	n.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6) Claim(s) $1-21$ is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	/or election requirement.	· .
Application Papers		· · ·
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	her	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		o by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to th		-
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	8119(a)-(d) or (f)
a) $[A I b]$ Some * c) None of:		3
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		Application No
3 Copies of the certified copies of the pri	iority documents have bee	n received in this National Stage
application from the International Bure	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
* See the attached detailed. Office action for a list	st of the certified conjes no	ot received.
	st of the certified copies no	
	st of the certified copies ho	• · ·
	st of the certified copies fic	• • •
Attachment(s)	st of the certified copies in	· .
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview	v Summary (PTO-413)
	4) 🔲 Interview Paper No	v Summary (PTO-413) b(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application

٠

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1-3 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Cassagnol et al. U.S. Pub. No. 20020129245 (hereinafter Cassagnol).

4. As per claim 1, Cassagnol discloses a method for providing an application to be executed on a device, the device being arranged with a secure environment to which access is strictly controlled by a device processor (Cassagnol: [0011]), the method comprising: providing the device (201) with an encrypted application (204) (Cassagnol: [0011]: receive encrypted information); providing, via a secure channel (207) into the secure environment (205), the device (201) with a first key for decrypting said encrypted application (204) (Cassagnol: [0111]-[0112]: receiving key from key server through secure channel); decrypting, in the secure environment (205), said encrypted application (204) by means of said first key (Cassagnol: [0025]: decrypt with first key); re-encrypting, in said secure environment, the application (209) by means of a second key (Cassagnol: [0025]: re-encrypt data with second key); and storing, outside said

secure environment, the re-encrypted application (Cassagnol: [0043]: the re-encrypted information is stored externally).

5. As per claim 2, Cassagnol discloses a method for providing an application to be executed on a device, the device being arranged with a secure environment to which access is strictly controlled by a device processor (Cassagnol: [0011]), the method comprising: providing the device (201) with an encrypted application (204) (Cassagnol: [0011]: receive encrypted information); providing, via a secure channel (207) into the secure environment (205), the device (201) with a first key for decrypting said encrypted application (204) (Cassagnol: [0111]-[0112]: receiving key from key server through secure channel); encrypting, in said secure environment (205), said first key by means of a second key (Cassagnol: [0058]: the encrypted key is stored externally); and storing, outside said secure environment (205), the encrypted first key (Cassagnol: [0058]).

6. As per claim 3, Cassagnol discloses the method according to claim 1. Cassagnol further discloses encrypting, in said secure environment (205), said first key by means of the second key; and storing, outside said secure environment (205), the encrypted first key (Cassagnol: [0058]: keys are encrypted and stored externally).

7. As per claim 8-10, claims 8-10 encompass the same scope as claims 1-3. Therefore, claims 8-10 are rejected based on the same reason set forth above in rejecting claims 1-3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4-6, 11-13, 15-17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassagnol in view of Matyas et al. U.S. Pat. No. 7051211 (hereinafter Matyas).

10. As per claim 4, Cassagnol discloses the method according to claim 1. Cassagnol does not explicitly disclose wherein said second key is symmetric and can be derived from the application (202). However, Matyas discloses generating a new key for re-encrypting protected software derived from the software (Matyas: column 10 lines 26-46: new key is generated from S and K and S is provided along with application). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to generate a new key based on information provided in the application because the derived information can be used as a seed in generating new key. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Matyas within the system of Cassagnol because it prevents malicious from using the first key by generating a new key based on additional information.

11. As per claim 5, Cassagnol discloses the method according to claim 4. Cassagnol as modified further discloses wherein said second key is comprised in the application (202) itself (Matyas: column 10 lines 26-46).

12. As per claim 6, Cassagnol discloses the method according to claim 4. Cassagnol as modified further discloses wherein said second key is generated in the secure environment (205) using an application seed (Cassagnol: [0025]: generating new key in the secure environment).

As per claim 11-13, 15-17 and 19-20, claims 11-13 encompass the same scope as claims
4-6. Therefore, claims 11-13, 15-17 and 19-20, claims 11-13 are rejected based on the same reason set forth above in rejecting claims 4-6.

14. Claims 7, 14, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassagnol in view of Takeuchi et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6647495 (hereinafter Takeuchi).

15. As per claim 7, Cassagnol discloses the method of claim 1. Cassagnol does not explicitly disclose wherein multiple keys can be transferred successively on the secure channel into the secure environment, each key being used to decrypt a corresponding encrypted application in the secure environment. However, Takeuchi discloses transmitting decryption key when protected software is transmitted to the program execution program (Takeuchi: figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to process different software with different keys sequentially. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Takeuchi within the system of Cassagnol because it is well known in the art to process multiple software within a single processor.

16. As per claim 14, 18 and 21, claims 14, 18 and 21 encompass the same scope as claim 7. Therefore, claims 14, 18 and 21 are rejected based on the same reason set forth above in rejecting claims 7.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Klemba et al. U.S. Pat. No. 7055040 discloses method for uniquely and securely loading software to an individual computer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Hon Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

SC

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Shin-Hon Chen Examiner Art Unit 2131

Page 7

CHRISTOPHER REVAK PRIMARY EXAMINER